UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/771,212	01/25/2001	Anoop Gupta	MS1-673US	7356

7590   05/28/2004

LEE & HAYES, PLLC,
Suite 500
421 W. Riverside Avenue
Spokane, WA 99201

EXAMINER
DENNISON, JERRY B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

DATE MAILED: 05/28/2004   3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 09/771,212	**Applicant(s)** GUPTA ET AL.
	Examiner J. Bret Dennison	**Art Unit** 2143

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*25 January 2001*</u>.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-48* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-48* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>*25 January 2001*</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some *   c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Action is in response to Application Number 09/771212 received on 25

January 2001.

2.   Claims 1-48 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 13 and 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

3.   Claim 13 recites the limitation "the electronic mail server" in lines 19-20, 21, and

23 on page 71. It is unclear to the Examiner which electronic mail server the limitation

is referring to for each occurrence. Appropriate correction is required.

4.   Claim 14 recites the limitation "the electronic mail server" in line2 on page 72. It

is unclear to the Examiner which electronic mail server the limitation is referring to for

each occurrence. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1- are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hansen et

al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,496,849).

5.   Regarding claims 1, 6, 13, 16, and 22, Hansen discloses one or more

computer-readable media having stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when

executed by one or more processors of a computer, causes the one or more processors

to perform acts including:

receiving collaborative electronic mail messages targeting one or more

recipients, each collaborative electronic mail message including a feedback portion in

which the one or more recipients can each add comments (Hansen, col. 3, line 65

through col. 4, line 7, and col. 4, lines 35-55, Hansen teaches a collaborative electronic

mail messaging system where dynamic content can be changed or updated by

participants in the group, allowing participants to add comments);

storing the content of the collaborative electronic mail message locally (Hansen,

col. 6, lines 23-45, Hansen teaches storing the messages in a database);

indicating, to a computing device corresponding to one or more of the recipients, both the existence of the collaborative electronic mail messages and when the collaborative electronic mail messages are modified (Hansen, col. 4, line 57 through col. 5, line 11, Hansen teaches dynamic content being represented in a dynamic content region of the zaplet);

identifying, to the computing device, that the source of each collaborative electronic mail message, as well as any modifications to the collaborative electronic mail message, is the author of the collaborative electronic mail message (Hansen, col. 5, lines 15-20); and

sending a message to each of one or more recipients of the new collaborative mail message, wherein the message includes an identifier of the new collaborative mail message at the application server and wherein the message identifies the creator as the sender of the message (Hansen, col. 3, line 65 through col. 4, line 5, Hansen teaches a collaborating communication system among participants in a group using messages),

the computer-readable media including:

an electronic mail server to receive a new collaborative mail message (Hansen, col. 6 line 65 through col. 7, line5);

another electronic mail server communicatively coupled to the electronic mail server (Hansen, col. 7, lines 27-63);

an application server, communicatively coupled to the electronic mail server, to store the content of the new collaborative mail message (Hansen, col. 7, lines 5-15); and

wherein the electronic mail server is further to forward a message including an identifier

of the content of the new collaborative mail message, as stored on the application

server, to the other electronic mail server, and wherein the message identifies the

creator of the new collaborative mail message as the sender of the message (Hansen,

col. 7, lines 27-63).

6.   Regarding claim 2, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 1, including wherein the plurality of instructions further cause the one

or more processors to perform acts including identifying, to the computing device, the

size of each collaborative electronic mail message, the size of a collaborative electronic

mail message including all of the content of the collaborative electronic mail message

(Hansen, col. 6, lines 33-55, Hansen teaches identifying message specific information,

which includes message sizes).

7.   Regarding claim 3, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 1, including wherein the new collaborative electronic mail message

includes an identifier of a location at an application server where the content of the new

collaborative electronic mail message is stored (Hansen, col. 6, lines 33-55, Hansen

teaches using a database to store all message information, and databases require

identifiers for location of the information on the server).

8.   Regarding claim 4, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 1, including wherein the plurality of instructions further cause the one

or more processors to perform acts including:

receiving, from one of the one or more recipients, a reply to the new to

collaborative electronic mail message (Hansen, col. 4, lines 45-50); and

communicating the reply to one or more electronic mail servers associated

with recipients of the new collaborative electronic mail message (Hansen, col. 4, lines 1-

10).

9.   Regarding claim 5, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 1, including wherein the plurality of instructions further cause the one

or more processors to perform acts including:

receiving, from one of the one or more recipients, a reply to the new collaborative

electronic mail message (Hansen, col. 2, lines 25-50, Hansen teaches users being able

to reply to messages);

communicating the reply to an electronic mail server from which the new

collaborative electronic mail message was received (Hansen, col. 6, lines 33-55,

Hansen teaches the users sending their replies to the server); and

receiving, from the electronic mail server, a modified collaborative electronic mail

message that incorporates the reply (Hansen, col. 4, lines 10-25, Hansen teaches when

the user accesses the server, the user receives the updated content).

10.   Regarding claims 7 and 14, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as

claimed, as described in claims 6 and 13, further comprising:

receiving a reply to the new collaborative mail message (Hansen, col. 12, lines

10-14);

modifying the new collaborative mail message in accordance with the

reply(Hansen, col. 12, lines 14-17); and

sending another message to each of the one or more recipients, wherein the

message includes an identifier of the modified collaborative mail message at the

application server and wherein the message identifies the creator as the sender of the

notification (Hansen, col. 4, lines 10-27, Hansen teaches when the users access the

server, the server sends the updated message).

11.   Regarding claims 8 and 15, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as

claimed, as described in claims 7 and 14, including wherein the identifier of the new

collaborative mail message and the identifier of the modified collaborative mail message

are the same identifier (Hansen, col. 5, lines 10-25, Hansen teaches users being able to

modify their own message).

12.   Regarding claim 9, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 6, including wherein the identifier comprises a uniform resource

locator (URL) (Hansen, col. 7, lines 10-15).

13.   Regarding claim 10, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 6, including wherein the sending comprises sending the message to

one or more mail servers associated with the one or more recipients (Hansen, col. 9,

lines 5-11).

14.   Regarding claim 11, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 6, including wherein the method is implemented

in an electronic mail server (Figure 2, 20, and 22).

15.   Regarding claims 12 and 21, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as

claimed, as described in claims 6 and 16, including one or more computer-readable

memories containing a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform

the method recited in claim 6 (Hansen, col. 6, line 65 through col. 7, line 67).

16.   Regarding claim 17, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 16, including wherein the collaborative electronic mail message

request comprises a request for a new collaborative electronic mail message (Hansen,

col. 9, lines 4-10, Hansen teaches initiating a new collaborative message).

17.   Regarding claim 18, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 16, including wherein the collaborative electronic mail message

request comprises a reply to a previous collaborative electronic mail message (Hansen, col. 2, lines 25-50, Hansen teaches users being able to reply to messages).

18.   Regarding claim 19, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 18, including wherein the storing comprises to modifying a previously stored collaborative electronic mail message (Hansen, col. 6, lines 33-55, Hansen teaches updating a previous zaplet message with current content in the dynamic content area).

19.   Regarding claim 20, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 16, further comprising maintaining for the collaborative electronic mail message:

a root identifier that identifies an initial collaborative electronic mail message corresponding to the collaborative electronic mail message (Hansen, col. 6, lines 23-55);

a parent identifier that identifies a parent collaborative electronic mail message corresponding to the collaborative electronic mail message (Hansen, col. 6, lines 23-55); and

a message identifier that identifies the collaborative electronic mail message (Hansen, col. 6, lines 23-55).

20.   Regarding claims 23 and 24, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as

claimed, as described in claim 22, including wherein the new request handler is to

receive requests for new collaborative mail messages or replies to collaborative mail

messages from other electronic mail servers (Hansen, Figure 1, 1-4, Hansen teaches

the system receiving requests from web/email clients, which can be other electronic

mail servers).

21.   Regarding claim 25, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 22, including wherein the new request handler is to receive, from a

client device corresponding to an author of a new collaborative mail message, a request

for the new collaborative mail message (Figure 6, 503); and

       communicate the request to one or more other electronic mail servers associated

with recipients of the new collaborative mail message (Figure 6, 504).

22.   Regarding claim 26, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 22, including wherein the reply request handler is to receive, from a

client device corresponding to a recipient of a new collaborative mail message, a

request to modify the new collaborative mail message, and communicate the request to

one or more other electronic mail servers associated with other recipients of the new

collaborative mail message or an author of the new collaborative mail message ((Figure

6, 503, col.5, lines 15-25).

23.   Regarding claim 27, Hansen discloses a method comprising:

receiving a response to a collaborative electronic mail message targeting to one

or more recipients (Hansen, col. 7, lines 5-15);

generating a new collaborative electronic mail message by modifying a stored

copy of the collaborative electronic mail message (Hansen, col. 6, lines 33-55, Hansen

teaches updating a previous zaplet message with current content in the dynamic

content area); and

communicating the response to one or more mail servers that each correspond

to one or more of the one or more recipients (Figure 6, 504).

24.   Regarding claim 28, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 27, including wherein the receiving comprises receiving the response

from one of the one or more mail servers and wherein the communicating comprises

communicating the response to the mail server from which the response was received

(Figure 6, 504).

25.   Regarding claim 29, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 27, further comprising identifying the content of the response to the

collaborative electronic email message and wherein the communicating comprises

communicating, as the response, the content of the response (Hansen, col. 4, lines 10-

28).

26.   Regarding claim 30, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 27, including wherein the response includes both the content of the collaborative electronic mail message as well as the content of the response, and wherein the communicating comprises communicating the response as received to the one or more mail servers (Hansen, col. 4, lines 10-28).

27.   Regarding claim 31, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 27, including one or more computer-readable memories containing a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform the method recited in claim 27 (Hansen, col. 6, line 65 through col. 7, line 67).

28.   Regarding claim 32, Hansen discloses an electronic mail server comprising:

a collaborative electronic mail storage location to maintain the content of a plurality of collaborative electronic mail messages (Hansen, col. 6, lines 23-55);

a reply request handler, coupled to the collaborative electronic mail storage location, to receive a reply to a collaborative electronic mail message maintained in the collaborative electronic mail storage location (Hansen, col. 4, lines 10-27),

modify the stored collaborative electronic mail message in accordance with the reply, and communicate an indication of the modifications to the stored collaborative electronic mail message to one or more electronic mail servers that each correspond to a recipient of the collaborative electronic mail message (Hansen, col. 4, lines 35-65).

29.   Regarding claim 33, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 32, including wherein the reply request handler is to receive the reply

from another electronic mail server and to communicate the indication of the

modifications to the stored collaborative electronic mail message to the other electronic

mail server (Hansen, col. 7, lines45-50).

30.   Regarding claim 34, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 32, including wherein the

indication includes only the changes to the collaborative electronic mail messages

that are included in the reply (Hansen, col. 4, lines 10-28).

31.   Regarding claim 35, Hansen discloses a method comprising:

        receiving, at a mail server, a response to a collaborative electronic mail message

(Hansen, col. 4, lines 3-6);

        entering the response as a tentative change to a copy of the collaborative

electronic mail message stored at the mail server (Hansen, col. 4, lines 10-28);

        communicating the response to another mail server (Hansen, col. 4, lines 10-28);

        receiving a message from the other mail server of a modification to the

collaborative electronic mail message, the modification being based on the

response (col. 4, lines 3-6, Input from the participants is accepted by the server); and

        making, in response to the message, the tentative change permanent (Hansen,

col. 4, lines 1-28).

32.   Regarding claim 36, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 35, further comprising including, in the

collaborative electronic mail message, an indication that the tentative change is not

permanent until the message from the other mail server is received (Hansen, col. 4,

lines 1-28, Hansen teaches updating the message after receiving input from other

participants).

33.   Regarding claim 37, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 35, including wherein the other mail server is a

 home server corresponding to the collaborative electronic mail message (Hansen, col.

6, line 65 through col. 7, line 65, Hansen discloses a server corresponding to the

collaborative electronic mail message).

34.   Regarding claim 38, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 35, including one or more computer-readable memories containing a

computer program that is executable by a processor to perform the method recited in

claim 35 (Hansen, col. 6, line 65 through col. 7, line 67).

35.   Regarding claim 39, Hansen discloses a method comprising:

        receiving a new collaborative electronic mail message request targeting one

or more recipients (Hansen, col. 9 , lines 5-10);

indicating, to a computing device corresponding to one of the recipients,

the existence of the new collaborative electronic mail message (Hansen, col. 5, lines

40-50, Hansen teaches participants using a computer equipped to receive or read e-

mail messages using standard email protocols); and

identifying, to the computing device, that the source of the new collaborative

electronic mail message is the author of the new collaborative electronic mail message

(Hansen, col. 5, lines 40-50, Hansen teaches participants using a computer equipped to

receive or read e-mail messages using standard email protocols. Standard email

messages include the author's identity).

36.   Regarding claim 40, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 39, further comprising:

determining a size of the new collaborative electronic mail message, the size

including the content of the new collaborative electronic mail message (Hansen, col. 5,

lines 40-50, Hansen teaches participants using a computer equipped to receive or read

e-mail messages using standard email protocols. Standard email messages include the

size of the email); and

identifying, to the computing device the size of the new collaborative electronic

mail message(Hansen, col. 5, lines 40-50, Hansen teaches participants using a

computer equipped to receive or read e-mail messages using standard email protocols.

Standard email messages identifying the size of the email).

37.   Regarding claim 41, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 39, further comprising:

wherein the new collaborative electronic mail message includes an identifier of a

location at an application server where the content of the new collaborative electronic

mail message is stored (Hansen, col. 6, lines 24-50).

38.   Regarding claim 42, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 39,further comprising:

receiving, from one of the one or more recipients, a reply to the new collaborative

electronic mail message (Hansen, col. 7, lines 45-60); and

communicating the reply to one or more electronic mail servers associated to

with recipients of the new collaborative electronic mail message (Hansen, col. 4, lines

10-28).

39.   Regarding claim 43, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 39, further comprising:

receiving, from one of the one or more recipients, a reply to the new collaborative

electronic mail message (Hansen, col. 7, lines 45-60);

communicating the reply to an electronic snail server from which the new

collaborative electronic mail message was received (Hansen, col. 4, lines 10-28); and

receiving, from the electronic mail server, a modified collaborative electronic mail

message that incorporates the reply (Hansen, col. 4, lines 10-28).

40.   Regarding claim 44, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 39, including one or more computer-readable memories containing a

computer program that is executable by a processor to perform the method recited in

claim 39 (Hansen, col. 6, line 65 through col. 7, line 67).

45. A computer-readable medium having stored thereon a data structure comprising:

a distribution list field that identifies the recipients of the collaborative electronic mail

message (Hansen, col. 6, line 23-50);

a content field that includes all of the content of a collaborative electronic

mail message, wherein replies to the collaborative electronic mail message alter the

content in the content field (Hansen, col. 6, line 23-50);

an author field that identifies an author of the content in the content field

(Hansen, col. 6, line 23-50);

41.   Regarding claim 46, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as

described in claim 45, including wherein the data structure further comprises a root

identifier that identifies an initial collaborative electronic mail message corresponding to

the collaborative electronic mail message (Hansen, col. 6, line 23-50).

42.   Regarding claim 47, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 45, including a parent identifier that identifies a parent collaborative electronic mail message corresponding to the collaborative electronic mail message (Hansen, col. 6, line 23-50).

43.   Regarding claim 48, Hansen teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 45, including a message identifier that identifies the collaborative electronic mail message (Hansen, col. 6, line 23-50).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Bret Dennison whose telephone number is (703)305-8756. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on (703) 308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

J. Bret Dennison
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2143

DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100